

I am much interested in the application and wish to lend my support for the conservation of *Thamnophis sirtalis infernalis* (Blainville, 1835) and *T. s. tetrataenia* (Cope in Yarrow, 1875). The case involves the stability of usage of these names, and frequency of usage is the determining factor especially in the non-taxonomic literature (inasmuch as taxonomists are the guardians of nomenclatural communication through all aspects of biology, not just among taxonomists). The usage of *T. s. tetrataenia* for the San Francisco garter snake in non-taxonomic as well as taxonomic literature in the past several decades is so extensive that replacement by the name *infernalis* would clearly be pervasively confusing throughout the broad spectrum of usage the name enjoys (paras. 5 and 6 of the application). A switch of the meaning of the name *infernalis*, currently used for the more widely distributed California red-sided garter snake, would serve no useful purpose other than rectification of a long-standing, unwitting and until now unknown error of identification. That error would be rectified by the proposed action of the present application, without disturbing established nomenclatural custom. I therefore strongly recommend approval of the proposals.

Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of 15 mammal specific names based on wild species which are antedated by or contemporary with those based on domestic animals

(Case 3010: see BZN 53: 28–37, 125, 192–200, 286–288; 54: 119–129, 189; 55: 43–46, 119–120)

(1) Nagy Szabolcs

*University of Agriculture, Institute of Animal Breeding,
H-9200 Mosonmagyaróvár, Vár u. 4, Hungary*

I have read the application and comments with great interest.

As part of my job I give lectures to students on animal breeding, including domestication, and I am sure that the proposals for the use of names contained in the application will be very useful to me. I have found much confusion in the Hungarian literature, as elsewhere, in the use of Latin names for domestic animals and their ancestors. I will henceforth be following the use of names set out in the application.

(2) Alvaro Mones

*Museo Nacional de Historia Natural, Casilla de Correo 399, 11000 Montevideo,
Uruguay*

I completely agree with the proposals in this application.

The only point on which I am a little doubtful is in the case of the guinea pig, *Cavia aperea* Erxleben, 1777. The systematics of caviids, and particularly of the genus *Cavia* Pallas, 1766, is in great need of revision. The name *C. aperea* is being applied to wild representatives with a very wide distribution, from northeastern Brazil to Uruguay and Argentina, although it is possible that different populations are not conspecific. As far as I know, it has not been demonstrated that *C. aperea* is the ancestor of the domestic form, *C. porcellus* (Linnaeus, 1758). The type locality of both forms is said